

CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 10 2007

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated January 10, 2007 and pursuant to a telephonic conference with Examiner on April 9, 2007. Applicants thank the Examiner for the opportunity to have the telephonic conference. Applicants have amended the claims to more completely recite and/or clarify key features of the invention and overcome the claim rejections. Support for the features added to the independent claims is found at paragraphs 0037 and 0036, respectively, of the specification (pages 12-13). No new matter has been added, and the amendments place the claims in better condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments to the claims. The discussion/arguments provided below reference the claims in their amended form.

CLAIMS REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

In the present Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-35 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants disagree with Examiner's characterization of Applicants Claim 1 and 31 (and other independent claims as non-statutory). Claims 1 and 31, which are method claims, are written in a claim format that is standard for a statutory method claim. The functionality provided by both claims is evident from reading the claim elements, given the teachings within Applicants' specification.

Nonetheless, Applicants have amended the claims to more squarely place all claims within the parameters of statutory subject matter. Specifically, Applicants relied on Examiner's suggestions on page 4 ("One technique for satisfying...device.") as to the type of language which would "satisfy" the 101 requirements. As noted during the telephonic conference, Applicants have utilized a reference to an output device in lieu of the "display device" suggested by Examiner. The amendments incorporate these suggestions and thus overcome the §101 rejections. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments and removal of the §101 rejections.

CLAIMS REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the present Office Action, Claims 1-10 and 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants have amended the relevant claims to rewrite in

definite form those elements that Examiner found to be indefinite. The amendment overcomes the §112 rejection, and Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection in light of the amendment.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the present Office Action, Claims 1-10 and 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jones* (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,731) in view of Microsoft Word. Further, Claims 11-19 and 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jones*, in view of Microsoft Word and *Burner* (U.S. Patent No. 6,282,548).

The above combinations of references do not render Applicants' claimed invention unpatentable because the combinations do not suggest the subject matter recited by Applicants' claims. Specifically, these combinations fail to suggest to one skilled in the art the subject matter related to the following elements/features, which are now recited by Applicant's claims:

associating a deletion of the bibliographical information to a concurrent deletion of the copy of the content, wherein the deletion of the bibliographical information triggers a concurrent deletion of the copy of the content.

As noted within Applicants' specification (para 0037, page 13), with the "automatic deletion" feature, "the copier is not able to keep the copy of the content without the bibliographical data attached, and deleting the latter information leads to an automatic deletion of the content." The copier thus "has to invest the time and effort to type in or recreate the content."

Jones provides a "document management system ... for recording and viewing metadata of a document." (Abstract). *Burner* provides a "method ... that displays metadata about a web page concurrently being displayed by a browser" (Abstract). *Microsoft Word* provides a basic illustration of a footnote feature, which shows source information for text in a document. None of these references nor the combinations thereof teaches or suggests associating the ability to delete bibliographical information with the concurrent deletion of the content itself (or copy of the content). The cited sections of the primary reference, *Jones*, for example, col. 10, lines 29-39 and lines 10-17 also do not suggest the above feature of Applicants' claims. Those sections

provide: (1) a description of metadata recorded independent of the task document and resources automatically recorded when workflow manager option is selected; and (2) being able to delete resources using a button, and defining an option to prompt a user to define relationships between a resource and a document if a resource field is not completed. Nothing in these sections suggests the above feature added to Applicants' independent claims.

This feature of the claimed invention prevents outright theft/copying/plagiarism of an original author's content by simply copying the electronic content and pasting the copied content into a document without also including biographical data. There is absolutely no suggestion in the references or combinations thereof of such a feature. Thus, one skilled in the art at the time of Applicants' invention would not find Applicants' claimed invention to be suggested by the above combinations of references. Applicants' claims are therefore allowable.


APR 10 2007

CONCLUSION

Applicants have diligently responded to the Office Action by (a) amending the claims to overcome the §§101, 112, and 103 rejections, and (b) providing arguments explaining why Applicants' claimed invention is not unpatentable over the various combinations of references. The amendments and arguments overcome the rejections, and Applicants respectfully request issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all claims now pending.

Applicants further respectfully request the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney of record at 512.343.6116 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Eustace P. Isidore
Reg. No. 56,104
Dillon & Yudell LLP
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway
Suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
512.343.6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)